UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,294	04/29/2006	Louis Robert Litwin	PU030110	8042

24498 7590 06/01/2010

Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations
THOMSON Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER	
PHU, PHUONG M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2611	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

ATTACHMENT

This Attachment is responsive to applicant's arguments filed on 05/20/10, with respect to the previous 103 rejections to claims 1-6, 8, 10-12, 14-18 and 20, as unpatentable over Karaoguz et al, in view of Seppanen et al.

The applicant's arguments have been considered, but are not persuasive.

The applicant mainly argues that it would not have been obvious for one skilled in the art, at the time the invention was made, to implement Karaoguz et al, in view of Seppanen et al, for teaching: (i) the limitation "memory which stores information associating networks with individual user operations which can be performed on each network using the transceiver", as recited in claim 1; and (ii) the limitation "configuring the device to perform a selected user operation in at least one specific network", as recited in claim 10.

-Regarding part (i), the examiner respectfully disagrees. Karaoguz et al does not teach a memory which stores information associating networks with individual user operations which can be performed on each network using the transceiver, as claimed. However, Karaoguz et al teaches the mobile device comprises a memory (84) for storing data, a display (98) for displaying data/messages (see figure 4), and he teaches that after said networks are identified, the user is informed via displayed message(s), which are transmitted from said networks and received by the mobile device, about said identified networks and their corresponding types of services for individual user operations, e.g., voice communications, data communications, etc., which can be performed on each network, (when selected and permitted), using the transceiver (see [0008, 0047, 0048, 0070]). Seppanen et al teaches that a memory can be used to store received data/message(s) for later retrieving to display them on a display to a user (see col. 6, lines 1-6).

Since Karaoguz et al does not teach in detail how the displayed message(s) are formed and displayed, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to implement Karaoguz et al, as taught by Seppanen et al, in such a way that after the messages are received by the mobile device, the memory would store information associating identified networks with individual user-operations/ network-services, which can be performed on each network, (when selected and permitted), using the transceiver, for later retrieving to display the information as the displayed message(s) on the display to a user, so that displayed message(s) would be obtained, as required and expected.

With the above rationale, three basic criteria to establish a prima facie case of obvious, according to M.P.E.P. 2143, are met, and are explained as following. Firstly, the motivation for one skilled in the art, at the time the invention was made, to implement Karaoguz et al, as taught by Seppanen et al, in such a way that after the messages are received by the mobile device, the memory (84) would store information associating identified networks with individual user-operations/ network-services, which can be performed on each network, (when selected and permitted), using the transceiver, for later retrieving to display the information as the displayed message(s) on the display to a user, is to solve the nature problem that Karaoguz et al does not teach in detail how the received information as the displayed message(s) is displayed on the display to the user. Secondly, with such the implementation, the resulted acquirement of the displayed message(s) is an expectation of success in obtaining displayed message(s) as required. And thirdly, with such the implementation, Karaoguz et al in view of Seppanen et al teaches the claimed limitation "memory which stores information associating networks with individual user operations which can be performed on each network using the transceiver".

-Regarding part (ii), the examiner also disagrees. As applied to claim 1, Karaoguz et al in view of Seppanen et al further teaches procedure (included in the mobile device) of configuring/constructing the device to perform a selected user operation in at least one specific network, (see Karaoguz et al, [0008, 0049]).

/Phuong Phu/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2611